

### **REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed January 15, 2004 (the "Office Action"). In the Office Action, Claims 5-9 and 12-17 were allowed. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of Claims 5-9 and 12-17. In order to advance prosecution of this case, Applicants amend Claims 1, 10, 13-14 and 17 and cancel Claims 11, and 21-27 without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, Claims 1-10, 12-17, 19 and 28-32 remain pending in the Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

### **Allowed Claims and Claims 28-32**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that Claims 5-9 and 12-17 are allowed. Applicants amend Claims 13, 14 and 17 so that each of those claims is in independent form. Such amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims.

Applicants note that Claims 28-32 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowed Claim 5 and therefore include each element of Claim 5. However, in the Office Action Summary of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 28-32 were rejected. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 28-32 should be allowed for depending from allowed Claim 5.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Claims 1-4, 19, 21-24 and 27-30**

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-4, 19, 21-24 and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,857,194 to Kelliher et al ("*Kelliher*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,960,200 to Eager ("*Eager*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Amended Claim 1 recites "wherein the control flow graph comprises plural nodes having associated arcs, at least some of the plural nodes associated with an output incident." Neither *Kelliher* nor *Eager* disclose, teach or suggest a control flow graph comprising plural nodes having associated arcs or plural nodes of a control flow graph associated with output

incidents. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is patentable over the cited art used in the rejection and request that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 each depends from Claim 1 and therefore includes each element of Claim 1. Applicants thus respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 2-4 be withdrawn because, as discussed above, Claim 1 is patentable over the cited art used in the rejection.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Claims 10 and 11**

The Office Action rejects Claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kelliher* as applied to Claim 1 in view of *Eager* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,125,391 to Meltzer ("*Meltzer*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Amended Claim 10 recites "wherein the control flow graph comprises plural nodes having associated arcs, at least some of the plural nodes associated with an output incident." Neither *Kelliher*, *Eager* nor *Meltzer* disclose, teach or suggest a control flow graph comprising plural nodes having associated arcs or plural nodes of a control flow graph associated with output incidents. The Examiner suggests that *Meltzer* discloses "plural nodes having arcs in a legacy system." See Office Action, page 4. The Examiner cites column 2, lines 55-56 of *Meltzer* which discloses a "node in the commerce network [establishing] an interface for transactions . . . ." However, no support is cited in *Meltzer* for plural nodes having associated arcs, at least some of the plural nodes associated with an output incident, nor does *Meltzer* disclose, teach or suggest these elements. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 10 is patentable over the cited art used in the rejection and request that the rejection of Claim 10 be withdrawn.

Claim 19 depends from Claim 10 and therefore includes each element of Claim 10. Applicants thus respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 19 be withdrawn because, as discussed above, Claim 19 is patentable over the cited art used in the rejection.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

If the present application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained, Applicants hereby request a telephone conference with the Examiner and further request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule the telephone conference.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the amount of \$172.00 to cover the fees for the additional independent claims to Deposit Account No. 05-0765 of Electronic Data Systems Corporation. Although Applicants believe no other fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-0765 of Electronic Data Systems Corporation.

Respectfully submitted,  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicants



Chad C. Walters  
Reg. No. 48,022

Date: April 15, 2004

Correspondence Address:  
BAKER BOTTS, L.L.P.  
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600  
Dallas, TX 75201-2980  
(214) 953-6511

Customer Number: **35005**